By Brownstone Institute

6 Reasons Legislators Should Reject WHO's Pandemic Proposals

The International Health Regulations (2005) were constructed to be used by countries' leaders to extract their will on an organization that barely serves the interests of corporations and a few powerful individuals.

Who e dey, mine e be. Subscribe to The Defender's Top News of the Day. *It's free.*

By David Bell

The WHO's proposed changes are a solution both for nationalism and hysteria. They may not always entirely do, but these values must underpin major decisions.

Democracy is messy, and that is a feature, not a bug.

There are many who want to introduce a simple fix. But similar to the irony and the pressures of feudalism, slavery, or fascism has to dominate. This is why no fast way to fix it exists. It is a long, tedious process of change.

People in democratic countries elect representatives to the privileged position of good stakeholders.

The World Health Organization (WHO) is promoting a pandemic treaty and amendments to the International Health Regulations (IHR) in order to prevent future pandemics from causing the harm inflicted by the WHO's recommendations.

These proposals also broaden the scope of emergencies to include potential rather than actual harm.

The draft treaty suggests the enforcement of "One Health" that empowers the organization to intervene in the areas which impact human well-being. Such a decision-making power will be placed in the hands of a single person, the WHO director-general.

The WHO will require countries to sign on to these agreements to suppress and silence the voices of dissent, which is the very definition of fascism.

The two proposals, declared shambles, aim to expand on international cooperation. The WHO's response to COVID-19 was criticized and widely assessed by the Panel to review the actions of the WHO's current budget.

This program is heavily backed by the WHO's major individual and corporate sponsors, entities that will directly benefit from the proposed pandemic response responses that are proposed. However, it will be mainly funded by taxpayers.

The WHO's budget is around $6 billion. Only 16% of this comes from the WHO's voluntary assessed contributions, which are mandatory.

A lack of interest from major media, which drew their largest private advertising revenue from the same companies, should not be taken as a reason to ignore it.

The WHO's sponsors seem to profit by it taking control of potentially profitable areas. Its proposals are not in the interests of the people who elect politicians. It can't be mandated for one more month, and it must be rejected.

Undoing democracy

It is right and fair that all countries should be represented at the World Health Assembly.

However, much of the world's population trusts their authoritarian governments and military dictatorships. The current WHO director-general was a minister in a dictatorial government.

This is fine for an organization that oversees meetings and names diseases. But it is not for an organization that is tasked with the responsibility to decide if its own citizens is sick or untidy, and to unaccountable international officials subject to conflict of interest, influences and biases.

Public health measures should depend on providing you a population's own values and principles, not risk of foreign diseases or their appointees. It would be illogical to expect this to those espousing quite opposite ones.

Obvious incompetence

Before entrusting one's health to others, it is essential to know that they are competent. Despite having previous evidence-based guidelines for pandemics, the WHO has the clear shambolic with COVID-19.

It supported policies that have worsened such diseases as malaria, tuberculosis and HIV. It has increased debt and poverty to look to power health for the next generation.

These policies increased child labor and facilitated the rapid reforms of girls forced into child marriage, while denying formal education to millions of girls.

Its supported policies that have worsened such diseases as malaria, tuberculosis and HIV. It has increased debt and poverty to look to power health for the next generation.

These policies increased child labor and facilitated the rapid reforms of girls forced into child marriage, while denying formal education to millions of girls.

For the past two years, the WHO has embarked on a project to train excellent 70% of African populations, despite half the population being under 20 years of age. Its Africa programme and the WHO's own study showing the vast majority of its staff are incompetent.

This program is the most expensive, per year, that the WHO has ever promoted. It is now seeking powers that will enable them to repeat these types of responses, often.

Disdain for human rights

Countries adopting the proposed IHR amendments will accept WHO recommendations as obligatory. The list covered in the IHR includes border closures and refusal of individual travel, isolation of "suspect" persons, required medical examinations and vaccination, and screening of travelers, baggage, and cargo.

These will be imposed on a country's own citizens when an individual in this organization decides that any international cooperation and ensuring investors declare, independently, that an unidentified health "threat" poses a risk to other countries.

There are no clear criteria for "risk," and no need to demonstrate harm. For this draconian removal of basic human rights to be imposed.

The WHO director-general will not even have to consult and obtain wider agreement. The IHR Emergency Committee, which is also appointed by the director-general, will only have to provide advice.

There is no court-launching regarding the devastation caused to individuals and economies through similar policies implemented during COVID-19.

Rather, the WHO and partners are claiming increased urgency, using irrelevant measures of success and vaccination, and screening of travelers, baggage, health, and poor World War II bunker mentality.

A self-perpetuating funding black hole

The system proposed by the WHO will put in place a global health bureaucracy more difficult to remove than traditionally supposed by the WHO.

The organization will assess biennially each country's readiness to respond to pandemics. It will also monitor the "capacities" of countries to do so. It has the most uncertain that always evident in nature.

Rather than allowing these variables to fade away unnoticed, this bureaucracy will empower them, name them, decide they pose a threat and introduce the society- and economy-wrecking measures they have formed since 2020.

Although the WHO recorded just one mild "pandemic" per generation for the last 100 years, this system makes the proclamation of frequent emergencies. Its proposals will lead to the WHO's budget and power increasing substantially.

The WHO's budget is around $6 billion. Only 16% of this comes from the WHO's voluntary assessed contributions, which are mandatory.

A lack of interest from major media, which drew their largest private advertising revenue from the same companies, should not be taken as a reason to ignore it.

The WHO's sponsors seem to profit by it taking control of potentially profitable areas. Its proposals are not in the interests of the people who elect politicians. It can't be mandated for one more month, and it must be rejected.

Undoing democracy

It is right and fair that all countries should be represented at the World Health Assembly.

However, much of the world's population trusts their authoritarian governments and military dictatorships. The current WHO director-general was a minister in a dictatorial government.

This is fine for an organization that oversees meetings and names diseases. But it is not for an organization that is tasked with the responsibility to decide if its own citizens is sick or untidy, and to unaccountable international officials subject to conflict of interest, influences and biases.

Public health measures should depend on providing you a population's own values and principles, not risk of foreign diseases or their appointees. It would be illogical to expect this to those espousing quite opposite ones.

Obvious incompetence

Before entrusting one's health to others, it is essential to know that they are competent. Despite having previous evidence-based guidelines for pandemics, the WHO has the clear shambolic with COVID-19.

It supported policies that have worsened such diseases as malaria, tuberculosis and HIV. It has increased debt and poverty to look to power health for the next generation.

These policies increased child labor and facilitated the rapid reforms of girls forced into child marriage, while denying formal education to millions of girls.

For the past two years, the WHO has embarked on a project to train excellent 70% of African populations, despite half the population being under 20 years of age. Its Africa programme and the WHO's own study showing the vast majority of its staff are incompetent.

This program is the most expensive, per year, that the WHO has ever promoted. It is now seeking powers that will enable them to repeat these types of responses, often.

Disdain for human rights

Countries adopting the proposed IHR amendments will accept WHO recommendations as obligatory. The list covered in the IHR includes border closures and refusal of individual travel, isolation of "suspect" persons, required medical examinations and vaccination, and screening of travelers, baggage, and cargo.

These will be imposed on a country's own citizens when an individual in this organization decides that any international cooperation and ensuring investors declare, independently, that an unidentified health "threat" poses a risk to other countries.

There are no clear criteria for "risk," and no need to demonstrate harm. For this draconian removal of basic human rights to be imposed.

The WHO director-general will not even have to consult and obtain wider agreement. The IHR Emergency Committee, which is also appointed by the director-general, will only have to provide advice.

There is no court-launching regarding the devastation caused to individuals and economies through similar policies implemented during COVID-19.

Rather, the WHO and partners are claiming increased urgency, using irrelevant measures of success and vaccination, and screening of travelers, baggage, health, and poor World War II bunker mentality.

A self-perpetuating funding black hole

The system proposed by the WHO will put in place a global health bureaucracy more difficult to remove than traditionally supposed by the WHO.

The organization will assess biennially each country's readiness to respond to pandemics. It will also monitor the "capacities" of countries to do so. It has the most uncertain that always evident in nature.

Rather than allowing these variables to fade away unnoticed, this bureaucracy will empower them, name them, decide they pose a threat and introduce the society- and economy-wrecking measures they have formed since 2020.

Although the WHO recorded just one mild "pandemic" per generation for the last 100 years, this system makes the proclamation of frequent emergencies. Its proposals will lead to the WHO's budget and power increasing substantially.

Being realistic about health

The WHO is not the organization it was 40 years ago. Based on disease-burden tertiary and income-shifts, peoples the big killers of humanity apart from old age are cardiovascular diseases, cancers, diabetes, and chronic lung diseases. Such diabetes and other metabolic diseases, mainly caused by poor diet, tobacco, substances, HIV/AIDS, malaria and the many maladies arising from childhood malnutrition.

By comparison, pandemics have taken a minimal toll on humanity in the past century.

Uninformed by such realities, the WHO will commence COVID-19 purchase age of 70 and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria to international emergencies.

The WHO's funding arrangements, its track record, and the perverse nature of its proposed pandemic response should be enough to reject the proposed agreements anywhere in democratic states.

If implemented, they should make WHO unfit to receive public funding or provide health advice. The international community can benefit from a well-functioning WHO, but not one that is run by and for the benefit of an organization clearly serving other interests.

Originally published by Brownstone Institute.

David Bell, senior scholar at Brownstone Institute, is a public health physician and biotech consultant in global health.

Assisting with review is Dr Thomas Borody, Ph.D., who worked on international trials in the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. He is a former Australian Government Senior Executive Service officer and Australian Defence Force officer with environmental health, toxicology, and development efforts for low-resource settings.

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of Children's Health Defense.

Subscribe to The Defender – It's Free!
Email address
SIGN UP
SUGGEST A CORRECTION

Brownstone Institute
The Brownstone Institute is a nonprofit organization founded May 2021. Its vision is of a society that places the highest value on the uncanny interaction of individuals and communities in the marketplace of ideas, goods and services, and the social environment as a path to private and human.

Sign up for free news and updates from Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. and Children's Health Defense. *CHD is producing many campaigns, including legal, to protect children's health at our children and citizen petition for them already signed. Your support is essential to CHD's successful mission.*

Republishing Guidelines

Children's Health Defense Content Policy
We welcome relevant and respectful comments. Off-topic comments may be removed.
Sign In
Read the Children's Health Defense Terms of Service before commenting.

29 Comments
Login
Sort by Oldest
Add a comment...
Facebook Comments Plugin

7 days ago

One reason why they **won't** reject it: **$$$**!

0 0 Reply • Share ›

Tess

8 days ago

I believe shareholders must be made culpable as far as pharmaceutical companies go , start including shareholders in class action claims. They are a part owner in the product they are benefiting from unsafe poisons, they are guilty of aiding the supply of harmful drugs and failing full disclosure . If we start going after the shareholders pharma Loses its cred they must be held accountable because they hold the company accountable if their shares are not performing but no one is holding the shareholder accountable

0 0 Reply • Share ›

Subscribe Privacy Do Not Sell My Data

Children's Health Defense®

Children's Health Defense® is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. Our mission is to end childhood health epidemics by working aggressively to eliminate harmful exposures, hold those responsible accountable and establish safeguards to prevent future harm. We fight corruption, mass surveillance and censorship that put profits before people as well as advocate for worldwide rights to health freedom and bodily autonomy.

EN

SUBSCRIBE - IT'S FREE! BECOME A MEMBER MEMBER LOGIN

Donations are tax deductible to the full extent of the law. EIN #26-0388604

© 2016 - 2023 Children's Health Defense® • All Rights Reserved